UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,364	05/11/2001	Michael A. Brundridge	016295.1089(DC-03069)	1288

23640 7590 06/03/2004

BAKER BOTTS, LLP
910 LOUISIANA
HOUSTON, TX 77002-4995

EXAMINER	
MCCARTHY, CHRISTOPHER S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2113	9

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/854,364	BRUNDRIDGE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher S. McCarthy	2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 April 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *11 May 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☒ Other: *Response to Arguments*.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Snover U.S. Patent 6,438,716, as cited in prior office action, which was mailed on 1/28/2004.

2. Claims 5, 10, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snover in view of Machiraju et al U.S. Patent 6,243,090, as cited in prior office action, which was mailed on 1/28/2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Snover U.S. Patent 6,438,716.

As per claim 1, Snover teaches a method of detecting and reporting failures in a computer comprised of assigning one or more alpha numeric designated event codes exclusively to a particular failure event (column 8, lines 17-30); detecting the particular failure event in a device

of the computer (column 1, lines 55-59); storing the one or more exclusively assigned event codes associated with the detected particular failureevent in an error log (column 8, lines 17-30); parsing the error log for the one or more stored event codes if the event codes compare to one or more determined values (column 8, line 54 – column 9, line 3; column 5, lines 60-65); and relating the parsed event codes to one or more frequently asked question (FAQ) files (column 7, lines 19-21; column 8, lines 19-21; column 1, lines 16-20).

As per claim 2, Snover teaches the method of detecting and reporting failures in a computer of claim 1 further comprising presenting the one or more FAQ files to a user (column 2, lines 20-21).

As per claim 3, Snover teaches the method of detecting and reporting failures in a computer of claim 1 wherein the error log is further parsed for redundant event codes (column 5, lines 60-65; column 9, lines 4-9).

As per claim 4, Snover teaches the method of detecting and reporting failures in a computer of claim 2 further comprising of providing customized pages related to the FAQ files to the user comprised of creating a template (column 8, line 66 – column 9, line 3); inputting into the template relevant content from the error log; and masking out non relevant content from the template (column 7, lines 1-9).

As per claim 6, Snover teaches a computer system comprising of a processor (column 3, lines 34-36); computer readable medium coupled to the processor (column 4, lines 1-4); and computer code, encoded in the computer readable medium, configured to cause the processor to assign one or more alpha numeric designated event codes exclusively to a particular failure event (column 8, lines 17-30); detect the particular failure event in a device of the computer (column 1,

lines 55-59); store the exclusively assigned event codes of the detected particular failure event in an error log (column 8, lines 17-30); parse the error log for the one or more stored event codes if the event codes compare to one or more determined values (column 8, line 54 – column 9, line 3; column 5, lines 60-65); and relate the one or more parsed event codes to one or more frequently asked question (FAQ) files (column 7, lines 19-21; column 8, lines 19-21; column 1, lines 16-20).

As per claim 7, Snover teaches the computer system of claim 6 wherein the processor is further configured to present the one or more FAQ files to a user (column 2, lines 20-21).

As per claim 8, Snover teaches the computer system of claim 6 wherein the error log is further parsed for redundant event codes (column 5, lines 60-65; column 9, lines 4-9).

As per claim 9, Snover teaches the computer system of claim 7 wherein the processor is further configured to provide customized pages related to the FAQ files to the user comprised of creating a template (column 8, line 66 – column 9, line 3); inputting into the template relevant content from the error log; and masking out non relevant content from the template (column 7, lines 1-9).

As per claim 11, Snover teaches a computer program product encoded in computer readable media (column 9, lines 52-58), the computer program product comprising a first set of instructions, executable on a computer system, configured to assign one or more alpha numeric designated event codes exclusively to a particular failure event (column 8, lines 17-30); a second set of instructions, executable on the computer system, configured to detect the particular failure event in a device of the computer (column 1, lines 55-59); a third set of instructions, executable on the computer system, configured to store the exclusively assigned one or more event codes of

the detected particular failures in an error log (column 8, lines 17-30); a fourth set of instructions, executable on the computer system, configured to parse the error log for the one or more stored event codes if the one or more event codes compare to one or more determined values (column 8, line 54 – column 9, line 3; column 5, lines 60-65); and a fifth set of instructions, executable on the computer system, configured to relate the parsed event codes to one or more frequently asked question (FAQ) files (column 7, lines 19-21; column 8, lines 19-21; column 1, lines 16-20).

As per claim 12, Snover teaches the computer program product of claim 1 further comprised of a sixth set of instructions, executable on the computer system, configured to present the related FAQ files to a user (column 2, lines 20-21).

As per claim 13, Snover teaches the computer program product of claim 1 further comprised of a seventh set of instructions, executable on the computer system, configured to parse the error log for redundant event codes (column 5, lines 60-65; column 9, lines 4-9).

As per claim 14, Snover teaches the computer program product of claim 12 further comprised of a eighth set of instructions, executable on the computer system, configured to provide customized pages related to the FAQ files to the user comprised of creating a template (column 8, line 66 – column 9, line 3); inputting into the template relevant content from the error log; and masking out non relevant content from the template (column 7, lines 1-9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 10, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snover in view of Machiraju et al U.S. Patent 6,243,090.

As per claim 5, Snover does teach the method of detecting and reporting failures in a computer of claim 4. Snover does not explicitly teach wherein the FAQ files and the template are written in HTML. Machiraju does teach wherein the FAQ files and the template are written in HTML (column 1, lines 42-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the HTML programming of Machiraju to the files and templates of Snover. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the HTML programming of Machiraju to the files and templates of Snover because Machiraju teaches the use of HTML-based FAQ's that can be exported by hyperlink to other locations over the Internet, a desire explicitly expressed in Snover in column 9, lines 50-51.

As per claim 10, Snover teaches the computer system of claim 9. Snover does not explicitly teach wherein the FAQ files and the template are written in HTML. Machiraju does teach wherein the FAQ files and the template are written in HTML (column 1, lines 42-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the HTML programming of Machiraju to the files and templates of Snover. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the HTML programming of Machiraju to the files and templates of Snover because Machiraju teaches the use of HTML-based FAQ's that can be exported by hyperlink to other locations over the Internet, a desire explicitly expressed in Snover in column 9, lines 50-51.

As per claim 15, Snover teaches the computer program product of claim 14. Snover does not explicitly teach wherein the FAQ files and the template are written in HTML. Machiraju does teach wherein the FAQ files and the template are written in HTML (column 1, lines 42-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the HTML programming of Machiraju to the files and templates of Snover. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the HTML programming of Machiraju to the files and templates of Snover because Machiraju teaches the use of HTML-based FAQ's that can be exported by hyperlink to other locations over the Internet, a desire explicitly expressed in Snover in column 9, lines 50-51.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 1/28/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claims 1, 6, and 11, the applicant argues that Snover does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of event codes to relate to FAQ files. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Snover teaches wherein each error event is logged into an error log. Each subsequent error event is systematically mapped to a predefined error code in the log. Snover teaches the method in column 7, lines 39-47, wherein each error has an attempted map to each error code until a successful candidate is matched to the error event. Furthermore, each time an error event is successfully mapped to an error code, its message is displayed to the user with possible solutions to the error event. The examiner determines this method of presenting the user with the

error and possible solution(s) as equivalent to the FAQ files of the present invention. The display of Snover, as mentioned above, can be seen in column 5, line 59 to column 6, line 67. Snover also teaches that this method of a GUI display to present what error has occurred and what solution is available is a common technique (column 1, lines 17-21). In light of the above arguments as well as arguments in the prior office action, all applicable claim rejections stand.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher S. McCarthy whose telephone number is (703)305-7599. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (703)305-9713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

csm
May 29, 2004

ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 21